UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Laws, Physical and Moral

By ZONA GALE

On the German Front

By THEODOR HAHN

The Function of a Thoroughly Modern Church

By EDWARD Z. ROWELL

News Letter from Geneva

By SYDNEY STRONG

VOLUME CX NUMBER 7

Chicago, October 31, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

	Page
EDITORIAL—	
Notes	99
Laws, Physical and Moral—ZONA GALE	101
Jottings—J. H. H.	102
ARTICLES—	
On the German Front—THEODOR HAHN	102
The Function of a Thoroughly Modern Church—EDWARD Z. ROWELL	104
News Letter from Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG	106
My Educational Mission—*Rabindranath Tagore*	108
POETRY—	
Election Day—*John Greenleaf Whittier*	99
THE STUDY TABLE—	
Reaction and Revolution—NATHAN ESSELL	109
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Religious Liberty—A Closing Word—A. STIERNOTTE	110
Jefferson's Monticello—EDWIN D. MEAD	111
THE FIELD—	
A Remarkable Letter	98
The Doukhobors—Christian Martyrs of Today—WALTER SIEGMEISTER	112

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Remarkable Letter

Lord Macauley to Hon. H. H. Randall of New York

London, May 23rd, 1857.

Dear Sir:

You are surprised to learn that I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I never in parliament, in conversation, or even on the hustings,—a place where it is the fashion to court the populace—uttered a word indicating the opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization, or both.

In Europe, where the population is dense, the effect of such institutions would be almost instantaneous. What happened lately in France is an example. In 1848 a pure democracy was established there. During a short time there was a strong reason to expect a general spoliation, a national bankruptcy, a new partition of the soil, a maximum of prices, a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness. Such a system would, in twenty years, have made France as poor and as barbarous as the France of the Carlovingians. Happily, the danger was averted and now there is a despotism, a silent tribune, and enslaved press, liberty is gone, but a civilization has been saved. I have not the smallest doubt that if we had a purely democratic government here, the effect would be the same. Either the poor would plunder the rich and civilization would perish, or order and property would be saved by a strong military government, and liberty would perish.

You may think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World; and while that is the case, the Jeffersonian policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams. Hundreds and thousands of artisans will assuredly be some time out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who will tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should

(Continued on page 111)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1932 Number 7

ELECTION DAY

The proudest now is but my peer,
The highest not more high;
Today, of all the weary year,
A king of men am I.
Today, alike are great and small,
The nameless and the known;
My palace is the people's hall,
The ballot-box my throne!

Who serves today upon the list
Beside the served shall stand;
Alike the crown and wrinkled fist,
The gloved and dainty hand!
The rich is level with the poor,
The weak is strong today;
And sleekest broadcloth counts no more
Than homespun frock of gray. . . .

While there's a grief to seek redress,
Or balance to adjust,
Where weighs our living manhood less
Than Mammon's vilest dust—
While there's a right to need my vote,
A wrong to sweep away,
Up! clouted knee and ragged coat!
A man's a man today!

—*John Greenleaf Whittier.*

Well, when this editorial is read, or very shortly thereafter, we shall all know the outcome of the great presidential election of 1932. So far as we can make out from the words of the prophets, the result is going to be a very close victory for Mr. Hoover, or else a sweeping triumph for Mr. Roosevelt. How the signs can point to these two possibilities at one and the same time is far more than we can fathom, but we gave up trying to fathom political prognostications a long time ago. What seems to us to be certain in this election is a slump all along the line from the high-peak enthusiasm of 1924. In that fierce contest between Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith an unprecedented number of voters went to the polls. As we remember it, Mr. Smith was the worst beaten candidate in the history of the Democratic Party, and yet received a larger number of votes than any candidate who ever supported the aegis of this Party. Well—no such mass of voters are going to the polls this year! The campaign has been tame beyond words to describe, and the election, whoever wins it, will be a "flop." Plenty of persons, with plenty to think about in their own private affairs, will be well content to stay at home and wish "a plague" on both the two great political "houses." Yet in this same flat election we anticipate a huge increase in the protest vote, both Socialist and Communist. We wish we could believe that the former party, under the inspired leadership of Norman Thomas, would win the three to four million votes confidently predicted by his managers and even by some competent and impartial observers. But this seems to us to be too good to be true, even in a period like the present. Let Thomas get anything over a million total and thus beat Debs's record, and we shall be satisfied. The main thing these days is to get a body of protesting electors strongly established. The trouble with third parties hitherto has been that they come—and go! But the Socialist Party is here to stay. Give it votes enough and straightway it will become our long-wished-for third party.

Straw voting used to be a game; now it is a major industry. In the old days, some newspaper reporter or curious informer would canvass the residents of his neighborhood, or his fellow-passengers on his morning train, or his fellow-topers in the evening assembly in the saloon. The result would be taken as amusing, but as having little significance beyond the range of the group consulted. But today the straw canvass has become nation-wide. Millions of citizens are consulted over a continental stretch of territory, and the poll is more and more coming to be accepted as a kind of preliminary election which reduces the legal balloting to a mere formality. Of the many straw voting contests now going on, two are of conspicuous importance—the one conducted by the *Literary Digest,* and the other conducted by the Hearst chain of newspapers. These are notable because millions of men and women are reached, and because every state in the Union is covered. Both these polls indicate the election of Mr. Roosevelt. In this they are confirmed by numerous local polls taken in various parts of the country. We have no doubt their prognostications will

be verified on the 8th of this month. Yet we can not help wishing that they would be disproved, not for Mr. Hoover's sake in this case, but for the sake of blasting the reliance which we are learning to place upon these canvasses. For we seriously doubt if it is a healthy thing for the voters of the nation to have their minds all made up as to the outcome of the election before they march to the ballot-boxes. Furthermore, in spite of remarkably accurate results, we still have our suspicion as to how the voting-lists are made up by the *Digest* and other papers. We think it strange, for example, that we have received no *Digest* ballot this year, and infrequently in other years. Nor have we ever seen a group in which a majority had been addressed. Of course, this practice is enormously profitable to the Post Office. Otherwise we might well urge the Government to declare straw voting as illegal as lotteries.

There is much discussion always of the place of religion in relation to politics. Should the church take a part in political campaigns? But this discussion has not been rife in this present campaign. Indeed, it is a long time since there has been a political campaign in which there has been so little interest on the part of the churches. The reasons are not far to seek. The Catholic issue disappeared with the retirement of "Al" Smith. The Protestants had no battle to fight for the defense of Washington against the assaults of the Vatican! Prohibition was relegated to the sidelines by the agreement of all parties, even the Socialist, to don bathing suits and take a swim. That the churches are through with the liquor issue is not to be believed, but there was little chance for activity in a campaign permanently disgraced by the abject surrender of the political forces of the nation to "booze." International policies might well have brought the churches to the enthusiastic support of Herbert Hoover. His opponent, Mr. Roosevelt, deliberately betrayed the League of Nations for convention votes, and now has behind him the sinister figure of Mr. Hearst. The President, on the other hand, has the German moratorium to his credit, and a genuine endeavor to secure some measure of disarmament. But the League was never so weak, the disarmament cause never so discouraging, international hopes never so low. What wonder that religious forces for peace are lying inert! No, the churches have had little to do in this campaign. Even the depression has not aroused them for both the two leading candidates are hopeless on this issue. If there has ever been a better illustration of what it means to have religion drop out of politics than that provided by this recent campaign, we do not know it. No moral principles, no courageous ideals, no genuine cause of progress, only personal bickerings and partisan bluster and ignoble appeals to prejudice and whim! The candidacy of Norman Thomas, conducted on a high plane of intellectuality and ethical fervor has alone served to redeem the times. Why did the churches not support *this* man as the true prophet of the better day?

The flight of Samuel Insull was like the suicide of Ivar Kruger—a confession of guilt! Especially was this made manifest when Insull began racing from country to country, and at last flew desperately by aeroplane to Greece where his lawyers had evidently advised him that there were no extradition facilities. Whether the lawyers were right remains to be seen. Meanwhile Insull, master millionaire, patron of the arts, ruler of the political destinies of city and state, stripped now of all his glittering fortune, hides and skulks like the humblest fugitive from justice. It is difficult to feel sympathy for this man, yet we confess the springs of pity are beginning to flow within our heart. For it is not because Insull is guilty that he is being hunted, but because he has been 'found out." What this man did is the commonest kind of practice in our American financial world. Thousands of men have done all that he did—and perhaps far more, and worse. But they were not overtaken by a depression, as Insull was. These others "got away" with their speculative adventures and thus became firmly established as "first citizens" of their communities. But Insull—well, he was caught in the worst financial hurricane this country has ever known, and now he must be seized and made a "scapegoat" for us all. What we would like to see, if Insull is brought to trial, is a similar handling of other men. The big industrialists and stock brokers, for example, who were Insull's associates in his vast enterprises! The politicians, big and little, who basked in his favor and connived at his operations! The bankers who must have financed his towering structures of credit! Yet even if all these men were brought to justice, what good would be accomplished? We would have satisfied a certain crude measure of justice, and sated our own fierce thirst for revenge. But Insull and his kind are only the practitioners of a system. It is this system that is at fault, not the men who operate and profit from it. And for this system we are all responsible just so long as we tolerate its existence. Insull is ourselves writ large!

Our valiant and valued friend, Mrs. Kate Crane-Gartz, writes to take exception to our statement that the bonus-grab is "loot." She says that she objects to the Legion demand only in the sense that "every unemployed man should have some of it." In this plea for governmental relief of all the unemployed, men and women alike, we are in heartiest agreement with Mrs. Gartz. But the bonus demand, of course, has no relation to unemployment as such. The Legion asks for money for its members not because they are unem-

ployed, but because they are *veterans*. It sets up a favored class of individuals, and demands that these be taken care of, though all others starve. Among these veterans of the Great War must be hundreds of thousands of men who, even in these dire days, are in no immediate need at all. Yet the Legion would have unemployed men taxed to provide funds for members of this favored group who are themselves at work and prosperous. If the American Legion were to insist that unemployed veterans be taken care of, like wounded veterans, well and good. Better still if it insisted that all citizens who cannot find employment be taken care of! But to set aside a group, any group, without respect to need or desert, and to say that these shall all be pensioners of government, this we regard as abominable. Perhaps it is just because 'the rugged individualism" of our economic system leaves the masses of men so helpless, that bonus grabs and pension scandals are so easily and successfully resorted to in this country. Some day we may be civilized enough to regard injury, sickness, unemployment, old age, as first charges upon government. We may come to feel that organized society has no higher or more primary duty than to guarantee to its people economic security. When that time comes, there will be no need of, and therefore no demand for, a bonus.

The death of ALFRED W. MARTIN, for more than twenty years associate leader of the Ethical Culture Society in New York, was sudden and grievous. His early fame came in his youthful years, when he left the Unitarian church to organize his free non-sectarian societies in Tacoma and later in Seattle. More than a generation ago, when denominationalism was still respectable, and church union movements were impossible, and federated and community churches had not yet been heard of, Mr. Martin stepped boldly out into the open, and founded his independent movement upon the frank basis of free and universal religion. It was this bold adventure which brought him to that study of comparative religion which made him one of the most sympathetic and enlightened interpreters of world faiths. His success, as well as a certain logic in his undertaking, led him in 1907 to the Ethical Culture movement where he found ample scope for his generous presentation of religion as an inclusive experience of man in quest of moral and spiritual ideals. In his later years he served as a kind of successor to the venerable Felix Adler on the platform of the New York Society. Mr. Martin was a man compounded of grace and charm and beauty. His public presence was entrancing, his private companionship an unending delight. His mind had something of the fineness of his personality. Highly trained, utterly free, bold and yet considerate, this mind proved through many years an ideal instrument for the popular interpretation of great themes. His culture was more profound than his gracious and easy speech might indicate. The happiest of expositors, he led a host of listeners to high levels of accurate and wide knowledge. His books were numerous—all of them true reflections of the man, a few of them permanent depositories of his wisdom. Mr. Martin made for himself a place of unique influence and distinction in the religious life of America. Now that he is gone, this place will remain empty.

Laws, Physical and Moral

Professor Denis Saurat, director of the Institute in France, in his book "The Three Conventions," says that just as the law of gravitation and other physical facts are no longer subjects for opinion and just as, similarly certain moral choices are no longer to be argued about, so there must be discoverable in the world of ideas, a body of principles which shall not be the victims of mere opinion. We all agree that cowardice is ignoble and justice desirable; no one would hold that electricity is a matter of opinion, or that water flowing uphill is a matter of personal belief or disbelief—but in the world of ideas we say quite gravely that this or that is or is not the truth *for us*. Professor Saurat holds that we need to establish a third convention, to add to our physical and, such as they are, to our moral conventions, namely, the convention of a body of *ideas* which shall be true for all minds. Then we shall not hear ourselves saying so often: This and that is true for me.

Especially is this need great in respect to human relationships. Here we continually say: "*I* think. *I* believe. *I* disagree." Especially we hear ourselves in independent opinion on that form of social reaction known as warfare, namely, a reaction whereby social disputes are settled by means of physical wounds and blood-shed, and death—the nearest of kin of the slaughtered and maimed being pensioned, and the surviving victors dictating terms, possessions, tribute and the like to the surviving vanquished.

Clearly this system is either a form of law, like hydraulics, or else its opposite is a form of law, like hydraulics. The point is: which, the system or its opposite, is a convention of nature—like electricity and its operations. Our business is not to say, "*I* think war has always been and will always be." Our business is to say, "Is warfare the truth for human relationship or is it not?" Is it a fundamental convention, like "honesty is the best policy" or is its opposite that fundamental convention? Which is the order of nature—discord or harmony?

If you are an anarchist, you will answer: "Every nation must look out for itself and if necessary prey upon all other nations." If you are a socialized being you will say: "The order of nature is harmony. The fundamental convention of nature is harmony. This is not opinion. This is fact."

It is remarkable that those who are most afraid of the word "anarchist" are most willing to practice anarchy—no less—in social and international relationships. To cry: "Every nation for itself. All is fair in war. In warfare all laws, human and divine, are suspended."

Now that is anarchy. It is not a convention of nature to suspend law. It is a convention of nature to obey law. From star to crystal, order is the convention of nature. Yet there is a brand of anarchist who asks us to believe that in human relationship alone, nature suspends her universal law and delights in discord.

To discover the laws of nature and the laws of social relationship are matters for education. And we may as well consider some aspects of education looking towards the discovery of a probable fundamental convention in human relationship—namely, the convention of order, already practiced with fair success by crystals and by stars.

ZONA GALE.

Jottings

We referred last week, in editorial, to Columbia's ban on out-door meetings of students and requirement of faculty supervision of indoor meetings. Before this editorial was printed, Columbia withdrew the objectionable ruling. We congratulate the University on a second thought which was infinitely better than its first. Now let the University of Pittsburgh be equally wise and withdraw its student loyalty pledge!

"Mr. Hoover Praises Mr. Hoover"—Editorial headline in the *Nation*.

Well, Mr. Roosevelt praises Mr. Roosevelt, for that matter. Let's be fair, and keep things even!

Give the devil his due! If in this country generally there was a tithe of the eagerness to free the Negro from his bonds that is shown by the Communists, there would be no longer any colored question.

The MacDonald Government in England was put in office more than a year ago to save the nation. Among other things, it was to preserve the gold standard—but England abandoned gold in less than three weeks. Also, this Government was to solve the unemployment problem—but the latest statistics show 2,859,828 unemployed, which is 126,046 *more* than a year ago. And it was for this that MacDonald destroyed his Labor Government and went over to the Tories!

Statistics show that marriages, births, and deaths were all fewer in the first six months of 1932 than in the first six months of 1931. We can understand this fact in the case of marriages and births, but not in the case of deaths. It may mean, as Bernard Shaw would undoubtedly say, that people no longer have any money to see the doctor when they are ill.

Ironies of Circumstance: (4)—that Americans seem willing that Germany, their enemy in the late war, should be relieved of reparations, but unwilling that England, France and Italy, their allies in the late war, should be relieved of debts.

J. H. H.

On the German Front

[From Our Special Correspondent]

A few months ago a well-known German representative of one of the largest newspapers in the United States closed his article with the prophesy that at the election which was then about to be held, Hindenburg would be re-elected and that after this election the German people, tired of going to the polls, would settle down in peace. By the time the article appeared, however, almost every reader already knew that a second election was inevitable. After the President was definitely elected, the Reichstag was dissolved, and therefore an election was necessary on July 31, which passed off much more quietly than had been expected. It proved again that there is no use in crossing the bridge until you come to it. The result of the election was greeted by many with a sigh of relief, and by the followers of Hitler with an outburst of disappointment. For they did not gain the majority vote, in spite of the great amount of propaganda which they made in the weeks before the election. It is true, they did gain considerably, but the majority is not yet on their side.

Even before the newly-elected Reichstag convened, there were doubts in the minds of many as to whether it could exist for very long. And truly enough, it was almost immediately dissolved and now the German people must once more go to the polls.

The article, "Let Us Bray," in a recent issue of UNITY aptly began with the statement that a modern paraphrase might run: "Of making elections there is no end, but much politics is a weariness to the flesh." One might quote further and say: "And the end is not yet."

The parades—and counter-parades—which were held during the two weeks preceding the last election,

showed fairly well how the wind was blowing. There was quite a display of military make-up. Germany is disarmed, but the Allies have themselves fostered the military spirit by their attitude toward the new German Republic ever since the Treaty was signed. In their refusal to support the Republic, they have laid the foundations for a dictatorship, or something similar to it.

The Hitler movement is in itself a strange growth. Their slogan, "Germany for the Germans," and their apparent aversion to everything that comes from anywhere outside of Germany, has a queer way of manifesting itself. The uniform is borrowed from England, the *Swastika* from the Orient, the red flag from Russia, the greeting with upraised hand from Italy. It would be more convincing if they had thought out a German uniform and a Germanic symbol for their flag.

The Socialists have come to see that the Hitler followers rather enjoy their parading, and that this propaganda is drawing many away from their own ranks. So they, too, had to have a uniform and flags and parades and the "Iron Front." On their red flag they have put three white arrows, and their greeting consists of a raised clenched fist and the word "Freiheit" (Freedom). Their uniform is similar to that of Hitler's men, only their shirts are green instead of brown.

Adolf Hitler, judged as a man, has very splendid qualities. He is a vegetarian, drinks no alcohol, does not smoke, and is a convincing lecturer. These qualities are undoubtedly the cause of his strength. The strength of his movement, however, lies in negation, in criticizing and promising to overthrow existing present conditions. It is true that present conditions in Germany, in fact, conditions which have prevailed since the War, are such that some remedy ought to be found to correct them. Hitler, like all leaders in times of stress, is a product of his time. The conditions have called him forth. Of himself he could not have gathered such a following. The program of the Hitler movement contains many contradictions. In order to counteract the principles of Karl Marx, the sanctity of private property is stressed, which is done to reassure property holders. On the other hand, great play is made of the injustice of the capitalists, which of course attracts the working-class. The Third Kingdom, as the Hitlerites call their proposed form of government, shall be one of "pure Germanism," with Jews and aliens relegated to an inferior status. It is not to be wondered at that the Hitler movement has grown so rapidly. All classes are represented therein, with youth predominating. These youth, who were still too young during the War to take part in it, have been told that the existing conditions are due to the new form of government and are promised that the Third Kingdom shall be one in which they will have a chance to realize their ideals. Political debts are to be gradually liquidated, but commercial debts will be respected. A new currency is also to be inaugurated. The form of government will be a sort of dictatorship; there is to be no parliament. Unquestioning obedience to the authority in command will be enforced. To many it seems strange that so great a number of the German people are willing to submit to such forced obedience, but this is no doubt due to the fact that the German is not politically schooled. He has for so many generations "taken orders" from someone higher up, that he no doubt feels more secure in following the orders of someone else than in settling political questions for himself.

All over on the street one hears the greeting, "Heil" (Hail, but with the meaning of "salvation") of the Hitler followers. In the tone of voice in which this greeting is given it is rather evident that the word is not spoken to convince others that the "Heil" (the salvation) of Germany rests with these adherents, but rather the desire to "get the goat" of the other fellow who is passing and who possibly does not belong to the Hitlerites. There is so much bickering and fault-finding on all sides that it is difficult to see any peaceful outcome to the whole situation.

What a contrast between this leader in modern Germany and the political leader in modern India! The former still believes that force alone can gain its end, whereas the latter not only preaches peace and tolerance and forgiveness, but puts these factors into actual practice. If Germany could today produce a spiritual leader instead of merely a political one, there is no doubt but that the majority of the German people would flock to his support, for the German by nature seeks the ideal. But unfortunately, up to now, no such spiritual leader has appeared. The former General Ludendorff recently expressed this idea very aptly when he called out to German youth: "Take off your brown shirts and put on again spotless white ones!"

There are those who say that Hitler will never achieve his objective. Indeed, he seems to be fated to be an "almost there." He was on the brink of becoming president of the German Republic, but did not attain this height. He was almost made Chancellor, but again did not quite "get there." He has tried to unify the German nation, and has brought it to the brink of civil war. He wished to correct certain social institutions and the labor unions were brought into a very critical situation. He wanted to bring about an internal revolution, and called forth a strong reactionary spirit. He tried to bring about a national Socialism, and only succeeded in strengthening international capitalism. He thought he could overthrow Marxism, and has only knitted the followers of Karl Marx more strongly together.

As a counter-weight to Hitler, stands Hindenburg. In the year when he was to celebrate his 85th birthday, he was elected to office for another period of seven years! He is the symbol of steadfastness. He has kept what peace and calm there still is in Germany.

The voting-ticket which was used at the last election was typical of the Germany of today—thirty-five different parties! Of course, the situation is growing more and more acute. The two parties, National Socialists (Nazis) and Kommunists (Kozis) are gradually being ranged one against the other, and the other parties are losing in numbers and importance as their members go over to one or the other of the two leading groups. Which will win for the next few years? No answer can be given at present. Both parties are giving promises of "better times," and as long as the economic situation is as unsettled as at present, so long will they gain followers who are ready to grasp at any straw that will hold out promise of help.

THEODOR HAHN.

Heilbronn, Germany.

The Function of a Thoroughly Modern Church*

William James, the brilliant teacher, once said that whenever we look a familiar object closely in the face it becomes strange. We may feel quite familiar with our baby's blue eyes, but if we ask why they are blue we are confronted with a problem in research. A six-year old child may be able to tell us the simple distinction between poetry and prose, but a closer examination of the subject calls for the analytical powers of students of literature or of aesthetics.

This principle holds true with reference to this subject. Any person who has attended a liberal church a few Sundays can tell that the dominant function of the church is to fight for freedom of religious thought, use rational methods in dealing with theological problems, show hospitality to people who have lost faith in creeds, and give full scope in religious thinking to the methods and attitudes of modern science. But on closer inquiry such a person is certain to discover that our problem is not simple, for it calls for a careful evaluation of much of our religious thinking and doing.

The problem before us resolves itself naturally into two questions. First: What should a thoroughly modern church be and do? But, a church cannot be modern in the abstract. It has to be modern in this world and in this age. Secondly: What, if any, are the special challenges which the world presents to the modern church at this particular time?

Modern cosmography is dominated today by an essential monism. This monism leads us to regard all the manifestations of nature as fundamentally continuous. Thus the spiritual life of man is viewed as representing phenomena as natural as does the physical life of man. It follows, then, that what we have in the realm of religion is in the same position epistemologically as what we have in the realm of the sciences and of philosophy. Here is our world. It is a world in which religion arises as naturally as does human culture. It is a world in which to know the phenomena of religion calls for the same toilsome intellectual searching which is called for in relation to other phenomena. It is a world which extends no special favors to the theologian.

The acceptance of this point of view as a postulate for our discussion requires that we have in mind a conception of religion which arises from it. It requires, in other words, that we ask ourselves at this point what religion is when it is studied naturalistically. We have not time to struggle with the problem of such a definition, unfortunately. We may, however, adopt a definition which is familiar to every modern student of religion and which we may treat, if we prefer, as simply a heuristic or methodological concept. As I shall use the term in this discussion, accordingly, it will signify: (1) concern over the most significant values of life; (2) faith and interest in the achievability of those values; (3) endeavor to sustain that faith and that interest; and, (4) struggle to achieve those values. It is my belief that this definition is inclusive enough to embrace every kind of religion.

The main implication of this definition of religion, when it is considered in the light of the monism referred to above, is that the achievement of religious values is man's affair and that it is at least immediately a this-worldly affair.

Now, hitherto, in order to achieve the goals of religion, Christian people have usually organized themselves into societies called churches. Through these churches they have carried on most of the religious activities which they have considered of value. According to the modern point of view these churches are thoroughly human institutions and are subject to changes dictated by relevant changes in human life. Our question, therefore, implies that we may need to make our church something different from what it has been in the past.

Sometimes people have believed that churches could be capable of holding a monopolistic position in the realm of religious activities. This point of view we cannot today regard as reasonable. The relation of a church to religion is analogous to the relation of a school to education or of an art institute to art. These institutions are just representative of the field to which they belong. They do not and cannot monopolize its activities. There exist educational interests and activities outside of our schools. There exist artistic interests and activities outside of art institutes. And, similarly, there exist religious interests and activities outside of our churches.

But, many men would ask, why maintain any churches in this modern day? If it is true that religious activities can go on outside such institutions, why not abandon those institutions? After all, are they not rather anachronistic in view of the dissolution of the religion of our fathers? Is it not time to give up frankly and positively what is already passing anyhow? I believe that theoretically, at least, the answer to these questions favors the continuance of the church. If we view the matter naturalistically, as has been suggested, we can see that all social institutions are built around our interests and values. So long as those values remain, men will be building institutions around them. We will always have schools so long as we value education. We will always have art institutes so long as we value art. And, by analogy, we will always have religious institutions of some sort so long as we seek the values called religious. It is quite possible that the church as we know it shall in time be transformed into an institution of a new order. But this principle of change applies to all other institutions. They may undergo radical change but they continue to be representative of the values which mankind seeks through them. Modern-minded people do not need to apologize for their interest in churches. To be modern does not require that we turn our backs indiscriminately on everything associated with the passing faith of our fathers. Our task is not simply to fight orthodoxy, pleasant and easy as that may be. Our task is to evaluate all that the past has given us and hold fast to that which is good.

What, then, should be the function or functions of a thoroughly modern church? What should the religious society of today try to do?

(1) The thoroughly modern church should be the nursery of the religious consciousness. It should cultivate in young and old deep concern over the highest values of life.

(2) The thoroughly modern church should be

*This is a part of an address presented before the Central Section of the Pacific Coast Conference of Unitarian Churches held in Berkeley, California.

an inspirer of men, furnishing to their minds and hearts such elevating stimulation as will enable them to push forward energetically toward their goals.

(3) The church should be the purger of the feelings and motivations of man. Through its services which we are accustomed to calling worship it should provide such a spiritual catharsis for men as will dissolve the pettinesses of their souls. Worship must be carried on for man's sake, not for God's sake. And, whatever may be our scientific interpretation of what transpires within us when we assume the attitudes of worship, one concern should never depart from our minds, and that concern is that every human community should always possess dignified cloisters for the cultivation of fineness in the soul of man.

(4) The thoroughly modern church should be a healer of souls. The healing of souls is an ever present necessity in human society. There always will be sick souls in the world—souls that are in confusion, souls that are weak, souls that are in despair. The growth of modern psychiatric science and practice is evidence enough that men need mental healing. We may wonder to what extent the church can well discharge the function of the professional psychiatrists, but of one thing we cannot be in doubt and that is that no church can adequately minister to its community without somehow meeting the needs of people in this respect.

(5) The thoroughly modern church should be a promoter of human welfare in the sense suggested by the old term of "philanthropy." It may be that it ought not to act directly as a social agency, but whatever methods or techniques a particular community employs in its welfare work the church ought to make this work one of its deep concerns.

(6) The thoroughly modern church should be a promoter of good will and cooperativeness in all human relations. The goal of religion can never be reached by men as individuals. It can only be reached in a good society.

(7) The thoroughly modern church should be as nearly as possible the generator of ideals. It can never be the sole generator of ideals, for these come out of the crucible of human experience and emerge without organized sponsorships; but it can be sensitive enough to the higher interests of mankind as to be the first to give voice to every higher principle of human living.

(8) The thoroughly modern church should be a prophet and propagandist of every element of a higher morality. There may be some doubt regarding several of the other functions of the church, but can there be doubt with reference to this one?

(9) The thoroughly modern church should concern itself directly or indirectly, with research into every problem affecting the welfare of humanity. It should be particularly tireless in its efforts to understand its own business as a society representing the interests of religion.

(10) The thoroughly modern church should be an interpreter of life.

(11) The thoroughly modern church should be the inventor and promoter of agencies and methods for incorporating every high standard into actual human living. Shall we just sing and pray about our ideals? The good life can be achieved only in and by a good society. Shall we wait until God makes us a gift of such a society or shall we attempt to create that society? The weakness of religions in the past has been that their leaders left the matter to God. When they wanted peace they prayed for it and talked about it. Shall we stop with that also? Or shall we strive to create the mechanisms which will put our ideals into actual effect? Woodrow Wilson did not stop with talk; he went ahead and gave us the mechanism of peace. Shall the church do less? Shall it even concern itself primarily with the fate of the human soul after death as has been suggested by the editor of one of our great newspapers? Shall it occupy itself with what Dean Mathews has called the rhetorical manicuring of people's common morals? Or shall it go actively into the great business of making this world a Kingdom of God?

But, isn't it a little silly to believe that the church could accomplish much in this way? Aren't ideals by their very nature mere dreams? They are dreams, but not merely dreams. They can be to social behavior what principles are to technology if we only take them seriously enough. Around the hearth at my home are often gathered groups of men from many walks of life. We talk of ideals, of peace, of business ethics, of human welfare. And always all these men stand for the good of mankind. But when they leave and return to their common duties they act as men paralyzed. Is this paralysis of our idealism a necessity? Can't we even *try* to apply it to our living? Is this idealism bound to fail? If it is bound to fail, then there is no use in being religious, for it is one of the important elements in religion that we have faith in the higher possibilities of life. That faith may ultimately be frustrated. We do not know. But until we know can there be a greater adventure than this effort to impose upon human life the highest principles of which we can conceive?

(12) The thoroughly modern church should be the supporter of every enterprise which meets the religious ideal.

Now, this may seem like a program which may be fit to be discussed in a treatise on the church but which is too large for practical adoption. I do not think this should be our impression, for churches have always made this their program in some measure. Besides, this principle ought to be acknowledged very frankly, that we cannot make every church alike. Churches must differ as communities differ. There can be no standardized church. At the very least, the dominant emphasis in one will have to be different from the dominant emphasis in another.

The second general question before us is: What, if any, are the special challenges which the world presents to the thoroughly modern church at this particular time?

I believe there are at least three such challen[ges]. The first comes from the confusion which domi[nates] the present age. There is an old French proverb [which] tells us that when we are rich we are poor. [This] dox holds true of our own time. We [are] richer than we are today in experien[ce], but it seems at the same time [we] been poorer than we are now i[n] Our vision is blurred. Our he[arts] because our ideas and ideals in[dis]is no clear voice which is h[eard] sounds which impinges on ou[r]

inadequate to the crying need. The cry of the age is for a constructive synthesis of our knowledge and our ideals, but there seems to exist in the world a conspiracy to make us believe that such a synthesis can never be made. Here is a modern devil great enough to challenge the church's best powers.

The second challenge comes from the breach which exists between religion and life. There existed a hope in the thirteenth century that in time the Roman Catholic church would be able to wed religion to life in a complete union. But when this hope was at its height it began to crumble. First came nationalism, then the revival of secular learning, then the industrial revolution, and finally the present vast multiplication of the variety of human interests. And the result? The result has been the almost complete secularization of life. We have so many interests, so many things to do, so much business to carry on, that religion has been pushed into the background and constitutes today only one of the thousands of interests of mankind. Orthodoxy with its fundamental other-worldliness has failed in its efforts to heal this breach. It is now gradually turning to a social-ethical emphasis whereby alone this breach can be narrowed, and, let us hope, closed. The thoroughly modern church stands in an excellent position to work toward this end. Let us turn to and close this gap between religion and life.

The third challenge arises out of the growing threat that we may lose faith in man. The realization of religious values in this world is man's task. But man has been peculiarly impotent in uplifting himself since the time of the World War. He has lost his old faiths in a paralyzing disillusionment. He has been willing to let special interests stand in the way of the higher interests of mankind. He has embraced the principle of *laissez faire* in business and professional ethics. He has been willing to stand by the theory of a straight economic determinism in the face of its overshadowing of the humane motives of life. He has been willing to toy with the destiny of millions of his kind to satisfy his whims and vagaries. He has learned to use the weapons of physical science and of psychology for private power and profit. He has shown unbelievable willingness to do his own higher interests incalculable harm. How can the religious man sustain his faith in the higher possibilities of life in the face of a society like this? There must be a way. And it is the business of the church to show it to the world.

EDWARD Z. ROWELL.

News Letter from Geneva

[From Our Special Correspondent]

August is Geneva's season for tourists and conferences. If you stand long enough on the long bridge across the Rhone, at the end of Rue du Mont-Blanc, you will see half the people you know. There pass E. I. Filene, George Paish, Bishop Cannon, Siegmund Schultze, Shailer Mathews, Manley O. Hudson—a company of 100 "Y" boys from the United States—a group of Alpine climbers from Sweden.

When the Disarmament Conference closed its Semester Session, I thought I'd get a rest. Alas, it was simply to turn from politicians to professors and theologians—and half of these were politically-minded. There was at least one exception. He has come clean on war, and besides he is a champion of a "Cause"—one or more. This was—

Stephen S. Wise. He was in Geneva three days for the Jewish Committee, of which he is Chairman, that considered two things (1) The present situation of the Jews in the world, and (2) shall there be held a World Jewish Congress, and when? Dr. Wise addressed a luncheon-group of one hundred and fifty, given by the American Club, in the International Club. It was a delight to hear him. Dr. Atkinson introduced him as among other distinctions "being one of New York's first citizens." On rising, he hastened to say he was trying his "best to rid New York of its citizen. He spoke plainly, eloquently, on the Jews by Christendom—the blackest spot It was deservedly hot. He declared elmed by disappointment and sor- ion like Germany should become monical fury, as that embodied terrified that the souls of Chris- soned. It is a terrible indict- of the Anglo-Saxon! No "Christian" went away from that luncheon, without feeling as if he had been watching a fresh crucifixion of his Lord. . . . Dr. Wise reached a high point too when, in referring to war, he slowly and solemnly declared: "I'd sooner die than lift my voice for any war. I have committed that sin—I'll never commit that sin again!" Would that all of us could have risen and cheered, and declared: "Here too!" Some day, Dr. Wise may campaign the world, as an Anti-War evangelist!

Sherwood Eddy. Here is another of the leaders of youth—few having more followers—who can be counted out when any war bugle blows; and, praise God, there are increasing thousands. If this disarmament process is not hastened, the individual citizens all over the world will take the matter into their own hands, and declare themselves War Resisters, and, armaments or not, they will not take part in any war! Sherwood Eddy came to Geneva with a party of forty, who had just come out of Russia—while he himself had spent several months in China, Japan and Manchuria. Few Americans have actually *seen* more of the conflict in the Far East, and few can tell a better story. He came to speak before the Institute of International Relations, August 14-19, with the general topic: "The World Crisis." He balanced the "case" of Japan and the "case" of China. It is a wretched situation at the best. He stated that Russia was having a struggle, that she would not fight any nation, unless compelled, at least until her second Five Year Plan had been completed. He graphically described the rapid growth of communism in Central China, it being a home-growth communism. He stated that the two most solid nations in Europe were Russia and Great Britain. He lamented that the League and the Lytton Commission

had got under way so slowly. It was heart-breaking to watch the movement of events, so tragic and disastrous!

Geneva reaches the peak in popular summer education in The Institute of International Relations. This is the ninth year. It ran from the 14th to the 19th of August. It is not under the direction of the League, but is in close sympathy, since the committee works in cooperation with the League of Nations organizations in Britain and America. This makes it rather orthodox in spirit and direction.

On Sunday afternoon there was a Garden Party at the home of Mme. d'Arcis, an hour's boat ride up the lake. Over two hundred walked over the lawn. Then all week following, forenoon, afternoon, evening, there were sessions—with lectures and questions—on "The World Crisis." The tuition is $8 for the course, with no privileges for the press or clergy! It comes rather tough to pay to hear addresses, when all winter one has been hearing the greatest living orators, for nothing—in fact, invited to come and listen! Those in attendance were chiefly students, with two-thirds of them women. Britain and America contributed a good share of the students and speakers.

Among the speakers were George Paish, Manley O. Hudson, Alfred Zimmern, Benjamin Gerig, G. P. Gooch. One of the regular speakers was

Munshi Iswar Saran. Along with H. B. Lee-Smith, a member of the last Labor Government and member of the Indian Round Table Conference, he spoke on "The Present Situation in India." The speech of Mr. Saran was of particular interest as he spoke as a member of the Indian Legislative Assembly and as an Indian Nationalist who had no bitterness or hostility against Britain. He made it plain that the movement for freedom in India under the inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi was resolved to employ only non-violent methods in the true spirit of love and humility. The greatest friend Britain had in India was Gandhi. In truth this novel experiment of winning freedom deserves to be watched carefully by the whole world. If successful, it is bound to revolutionize our thought and take us a long way on the path to non-violence and peace.

Mr. Saran thought that Gandhi had the key of the situation in his hand. For peace, an agreement with him was essential. Nothing could succeed without the cooperation of this man of destiny. He deplored the British policy of repression. Thousands of men and women were sent to prison, hundreds were beaten, and a number were killed, but the movement did not show any sure signs of being suppressed. He asserted that repression and Ordinance rule could not solve the problem. What was needed was peace with Gandhi.

Mr. Saran has no doubt that only the substance of freedom would satisfy India; no installments of reforms, however large, could stop agitation and trouble. He said that a free India would not only serve herself and Britain but the entire world.

A few of the speakers, like Mr. Eddy and Mr. Saran, were burning up with their themes—but, only a few. The most of them were academic. It sounded like old stuff. They were all pro-leaguers, which fact robs the Institute of some of the scientific aspect. Back in the mind you could often detect lurking the evangelistic note of "Join the League and be saved." And, in discussion of reparations and debts, it was easy to see a strong drift in the argument, that to be saved from the World Crisis, the debts must be forgotten and forgiven—and there was a stern look at Uncle Sam, as having the next move. (I might as well say it here, namely, that it is my judgment that U. S. A. and G. B. are about equally able financially to do debt-sponging.)

The Institute is considering a topic for the next Session, in 1933. It is even thinking of continuing on the topic of the World Crisis. Why have another week of a prolonged Turkish bath? It was one day of depression after another. Here is a far better topic, namely, "After the Crisis—the Morning Light Is Breaking" or take the grand motto of The City of Geneva, namely "After Darkness—Light." Or, invite Professor Piccard to open the Institute, speaking on "The Stratosphere" and choose that for the great idea of the Institute. I am not joking. Rather, the Committee of the Institute needs to wake up, and turn its face upward to the front. Also, to get among its speakers more of the unorthodox, men and women who represent the work-room instead of the class-room. "Recovery" as one of the speakers said is "not enough—reconstruction is essential." The Institute is a fine conception. The more sectarian it is, the less will be its usefulness. It was unfortunate to change the place of meeting for one session, on the ground that the theme was controversial! What vital theme is not controversial? Rather, prepare a program, from which themes that are so dead as to be uncontroversial, shall be debarred.

An interesting group has been meeting for a week, planning for a World Conference for International Peace Through Religion. The question before them daily has been: "What can Religion contribute toward the Establishment of World Peace and the Outlawry of War?" "How can the Forces of Religion in all Nations be Mobilized against War and that Spirit that makes for War?"

A score of faiths are represented in this group. They are planning for a World Conference—time not yet decided. A group that has Shailer Mathews for Chairman and Henry A. Atkinson for Executive Secretary may be trusted; first, not to confuse religion with ecclesiasticism; next, not to overlook the necessity of social justice; next, that the concerted action they are after implies the elimination of war and the things that make for war.

We wish them all good luck. They have a hard task. A work of several years is before them. They are now engaged in surveying and in educating the nations in the big idea. They seek to lay the foundations for permanent peace. I see that men like Einstein, Gandhi and Tagore are with them.

Will these workers for peace accept a few suggestions: they must remember that piety is not sufficient—a return to St. Jerome will not answer; second, there is around these men of faith too much "crisis" atmosphere. Cheer up! I would note, that on the very day that they were conferring, with their heads together, Piccard was up in the Stratosphere. A good hint. Also, while they were considering, Mollison had flown the ocean. And, as I write these words, the Graf Zeppelin is passing overhead, high in sky. Ye men of faith—look up!

SYDNEY STRONG

Care American Express,
Geneva, Switzerland.

My Educational Mission

I am an artist and not a man of science, and therefore my institution necessarily has assumed the aspect of a work of art and not that of a pedagogical laboratory. And this is the reason why I find it difficult to give men a distinct idea of my work which has been continually growing for the last thirty years. With it my own mind has grown and my own ideal of education found freedom to reach its fullness through a vital process so elusive that the picture of its unity cannot be analyzed.

Children's minds are sensitive to the influences of the great world to which they have been born. This delicate receptivity of their passive mind helps them, without their feeling any strain, to master language, that most complex instrument of expression, full of ideas that are indefinable and symbols that deal with abstractions. Through their natural gift of guessing, children learn the meaning of the words which we cannot explain.

But it is just at this critical period that the child's life is brought into the education factory, lifeless, colorless, dissociated from the context of the universe, with bare white walls staring like eyeballs of the dead. The children have to sit inert whilst lessons are pelted at them like hailstones on flowers.

I believe that children should be surrounded with the things of Nature that have their own educational value. Their minds should be allowed to stumble on and be surprised at everything that happens before them in the life of today. The new tomorrow will stimulate their attention with new facts of life.

The minds of the adults are crowded; the stream of lessons perpetually flowing from the heart of Nature does not fully touch them; they choose those that are useful, rejecting the rest as inadmissible. The children have no such distractions. With them every new fact comes to a mind that is always open, with an abundant hospitality. And through this exuberant, indiscriminate acceptance they learn innumerable facts within a short time, amazing compared to our own slowness. Those are the most important lessons of life that are thus learnt in the first few years of our career.

Because, when I was young, I underwent the mechanical pressure of a teaching process, one of man's most cruel and most wasteful mistakes, I felt it my duty to found a school where the children might be free in spite of the school.

At the age of twelve I was first coerced into learning English. Most Englishmen and Americans are blissfully unconscious of the mercilessness of their language. They will admit, however, that neither its spelling, nor its syntax, is perfectly rational. The penalty for this I had to pay, without having done anything to deserve it, with the exception of being born ignorant.

When in the evening my English teacher came I was dragged to my daily doom at a most unsympathetic desk and an unprepossessing textbook containing lessons that are followed by rows of separated syllables with accent marks like soldiers' bayonets.

As for that teacher, I can never forgive him. He was so inordinately conscientious! He insisted on coming every single evening—there never seemed to be either illness or death in his family. He was so preposterously punctual too. I remember how the fascination for the frightful attracted me every evening to the terrace facing the road; and just at the right moment, his fateful umbrella—for bad weather never prevented him from coming—would appear at the bend of our lane.

Remembering the experience of my young days, of the schoolmasters and the classrooms, also knowing something of the natural school which Nature herself supplies to all her creatures, I established my institution in a beautiful spot, far away from the town, where the children had the greatest freedom possible under the shade of ancient trees and the field around open to the verge of horizon.

From the beginning I tried to create an atmosphere which I considered to be more important than the class teaching. The atmosphere of Nature's own beauty was there waiting for us from time immemorial, with her varied gifts of colors and dance, flowers and fruits, with the joy of her mornings and the peace of her starry nights. I wrote songs to suit the different seasons to celebrate the coming of spring and the resonant season of the rains following the pitiless months of summer. When Nature herself sends her message we ought to acknowledge its compelling invitation. If we pay all our dutiful attention to mathematics while the kiss of rain thrills the heart of the surrounding trees, we are ostracized by the spirit of the universe. Our holidays are unexpected like Nature's own. Clouds gather above the rows of the palm trees without any previous notice; we gladly submit to its sudden suggestion and run wildly away from our Sanskrit grammar. To alienate our sympathy from the world of birds and trees is a barbarity which is not allowed in my institution.

I invited renowned artists from the city to live at the school, leaving them free to produce their own work, which the boys and girls watch if they feel inclined. It is the same with my own work. I compose my songs and poems, the teachers sit round me and listen. The children are naturally attracted, and they peep in and gather, even if they do not fully understand, something fresh from the heart of the composer.

From the commencement of our work we have encouraged our children to be of service to our neighbors from which has grown up a village reconstruction work in our neighborhood, unique in the whole of India. Round our educational work the villages have grouped themselves, in which sympathy for Nature and service for Man have become one. In such extension of sympathy and service our mind realizes its true freedom.

Along with this has grown an inspiration for even a higher freedom, a freedom from all racial and national prejudice. Children's sympathy is often deliberately made narrow and distorted, making them incapable of understanding alien peoples with different languages and cultures. This causes us, when our growing souls demand it, to grope after each other in ignorance, to suffer from the blindness of this age. The worst fetters come when children lose their freedom of heart in love.

We are building up our institution upon the ideal of the spiritual unity of all races. I hope it is going to be a great meeting place for individuals from all countries who believe in the divine humanity, and who

wish to make atonement for the cruel disloyalty displayed against her by men. Such idealists I have often met in my travels in the West, unknown persons of no special reputation, who suffer and struggle for a cause most often ignored by the clever and the powerful. These nameless individuals, I am sure, will alter the outlook for the future; by them will be ushered a new sunrise of truth and love, like that great personality, who had only a small number of disciples from among the insignificant, and who at the end of his career presented a pitiful picture of utter failure. He was reviled by those in power, unknown by the larger world and suffered an inglorious death, and yet through the symbol of this utmost failure he conquers and lives for ever.

For some time past education has lacked idealism in its mere exercise of an intellect which has no depth of sentiment. The one desire produced in the heart of the students has been an admission to win success in the world—not to reach some inner standard of perfection, not to obtain self-emancipation.

Let me confess this fact, that I have my faith in higher ideals. At the same time, I have a great feeling of delicacy in giving utterance to them, because of certain modern obstacles. We have nowadays to be merely commonplace. We have to wait on the reports in the newspapers, representative of the whole machinery which has been growing up all over the world for the making of life superficial. It is difficult to fight through such obstructions and to come to the center of humanity.

However, I have this one satisfaction, that I am at least able to put before the world the mission to which these last years of my life have been devoted. As a servant of the great cause I must be frank and strong in urging upon all this mission. I represent in my institution an ideal of brotherhood, where men of different countries and different languages can come together. I believe in the spiritual unity of man and therefore I ask the world to accept this task from me. Unless it comes and says: "We also recognize this ideal," I shall know that this mission has failed.

—*Rabindranath Tagore.*

New India.

The Study Table

Reaction and Revolution

The attitude and relationship to the *status quo* marks essentially the *leit motif* of certain individuals and organizations of individuals. This principle, at any rate, constitutes for me the logical key-log in the jam of four books* that are at the moment being criticized.

The first book is the work of a veteran journalist, using that word in the best sense of the word. Mr. Duffield, the author, earns his place in the company of such authoritative journalists as Nathaniel Peffer, Louis Fischer, Paul Anderson and the like. And he does this by exhibiting those same sterling qualities that set off the interpreter-philosopher from the mere reporter. Assembling facts and data with the cool objectivity of the scientist looking down his microscope, this author doesn't stop at that but fearlessly goes on to interpret what must of necessity go on behind the scenes.

Like a master surgeon, Duffield makes a complete dissection and analysis of the corporate American Legion, takes it apart, shows how the intrenched interests by their contributions acted as its god-father, if not its very progenitor; describes the contortionist tactics by which the legion swung into politics with a vengeance, in spite of its constitution to the contrary; lists its program of self-interest through raids on the treasury, the last of which was delayed only by the spectacular dash of the President of the United States appearing in the flesh before the Legionnaires; and marshals his facts from which the only conclusion possible is that the Legion is on the side of the jingoists, the bigger army and navy advocates, and is unalterably opposed to what it terms "subversive interests," in which it lumps together the quarter of the spectrum ranging from the "pinks" to the "reds," including such strange bed-fellows as the Communists and the Federal Council of Churches, Wm. Z. Foster and the Rev. Dr. Harry F. Ward, Professor of Christian Ethics.

In his criticsm of this book, Dr. Gustavus Myers says that the Legion has only followed in the footsteps of the G. A. R., "so that, after all, there has been nothing phenomenal in the American Legion importuning Congress for pension, bonus and compensation laws; it has but followed and elaborated precedent." Oh, but it has done much more than that, as shown by its "red" and pacifist baiting, but even more important, is assuming the role of guardian of our capitalistic economic order, which it sees should not be changed one tittle or jottle. As such the Legion constitutes a menace not only in its own expansive desires, but also in its reactionary alliances. To these professional patrioteers and flag-wavers, does there not too often apply the dictum, "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

The portraits which are assembled in the second book are of leading revolutionists throughout the world, some of them rebels to the bitter end, others renegades to a better end. That is, better for themselves! Among these, the author includes such washed-out figures as Ramsay MacDonald, whom Harold Laski has just put in his proper historical place; Mussolini, who evolved through the philosophy of Anarchism to the practice of dictatorship; Pilsudski, the man on horseback in Poland; Aristide Briand, who stepped upon the political stage as a radical only later to lend himself to strike-breaking (his efforts for peace should be recognized), and Philip Scheidemann, of the Social-Democrats that Lenin called betrayers of the workers' revolution. All of these figures, revolutionists, as they grew older performed the usual trick of swinging to the right.

His admiration the author reserves for the Anarchist, Enrico Malatesta, whose temperament has been likened to that of Gandhi, Wm. Z. Foster, the radical leader in America who dreams of world-revolution, which is the primary article of faith of the third and

*"King Legion," by Marcus Duffield. Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. New York. $3.00.
"Rebels and Renegades," by Max Nomad. The Macmillan Co. New York. $3.00.
"Toward Soviet America," by William Z. Foster. Coward-McCann. New York. $2.50.
"Seven Years in Soviet Russia," by Paul Scheffer. The Macmillan Co. New York. $3.00.

greatest of these portraits, Trotzky, of whom it may be said "revolution devours its own children." It is evident that the author has taken the world labor movement as his subject and has painted the leading Socialists and Marxians in different countries, putting in the high-lights and shadows as they veer from reaction to liberalism and on to radicalism and then back again, *mutatis mutandis*. It should make us a little more definite, when we talk of Socialists and Marxians, to declare the variety we have in mind, for it boils down to this—Socialism is a strand that runs through so-called liberalism to Anarchism. It is worthy of note that the author, like his hero Malatesta, adversely criticizes the Soviets that he sees as the substitution of an intellectual oligarchy for a royal one, but unlike him—and correctly—admits that it hails the dawn of a new day for the masses of the earth. This gallery of portraits is a splendid one.

It is the same Wm. Z. Foster, mentioned above, who is the author of the third book. No mere academician, he is the leader on the field of labor battles in America, his most famous one waged in the great 1919 Steel Strike, in which, incidentally, the Federal Council of Churches took a hand on the side of the underdog. Believing in "thou killest me or I killest thou," Foster turns about and tells the American Legion that on his coming into power, one of the first things he would attend to would be to liquidate that organization, as they, the Legion, are trying to do to them, the Communists.

With the advent of Sovietism in America, which Foster predicts for us, the Communists would turn on all enemies of the working class. Among these he includes such Socialists as Norman Thomas and A. J. Muste, whom he likens to the American Legion and the A. F. of L., in their betrayal of the workers. The church would also go by the board, as it is doing in Soviet Russia, which is of course his model for this manifesto that he is serving us. But, surely, Foster knows that the church is at times the first to come to the aid of the labor movement, as in the above-mentioned Steel Strike. Or even take the more recent Centralia affair and the Mooney Case!

Foster errs again when he claims that the Communists are increasing in strength. In a tumultuous industrial time like this, there has been no appreciable addition to the forces of the Communists. Again, when he pleads against Trotzkyism, he is merely self-contradictory, for he accepts the latter's world-revolution while taking his orders from Stalin. He is on firmer ground when he becomes rhapsodic about accomplishments in Soviet Russia; he declares that only with the establishment of a Soviet America will the same be achieved here. His reasoning is that the changes that must be brought about cannot be done under the present capitalistic regime, and that the only way left is to have recourse to revolution. At this point we are confronted with a grim dilemma in *klassenkampf*. If the propertied interests will not of their own volition surrender their privileges—and they never have done so in history—and the Socialists are against confiscation—as they have just declared in their convention—then it seems that revolution is inevitable. For the struggle between the classes, that is ever present even though below the surface, must finally come to a head. This is Lenin's and Bukhanin's exposition of Marx's dialectical materialism.

In the fourth book we find Soviet Russia painted in darker hue than the roseate color described above. The author, a German journalist who lived many years in the land of the sickle and the hammer, disagreed with its judicial and industrial system, and, saying so, on attempting to re-enter the Soviet Republic, could not get his visa renewed. His objectivity gradually veers over, very understandably, to a corrosive manner of writing, in which he excoriates the Communists for their dictatorship. He waxes bitterer as he goes along, claiming that the truth is not permitted to be published abroad. But, surely, this is not true today!

He re-affirms an actuality which many have begun to decry, not alone to deny. He is witness to the fact that world revolution is still a cardinal principle of faith of the Communists, and that they have not retreated in their allegiance to that goal. They are merely biding their time, he says. The author is here arriving at the same conclusion Professor Calvin Hoover (an interesting name) comes to, when he says, "Internationalism is one of the most fundamental of Marxian tenets. . . . Anyone who thinks that Stalin could eliminate the world revolution from the creed of Russian Communism, even if he wished, does not understand the fundamental nature of the party."

Paul Scheffer misses fire, however, when he declares that, without Stalin, the ground on which the regime stands would be cut away from under the people. When he says that the structure raised by the Communists in Russia would, with the removal of Stalin, come crashing to the ground, he is lending too much weight to the personal element in a system that rests on historical materialism.

The answer to be made to Mr. Scheffer is, in my opinion, contained in the writings of another, if not abler, German correspondent, Mr. Feiler, in his "The Russian Experiment." This compatriot of Scheffer came closest to answering all indictments of and objections to the Soviet regime when he wrote the wisest words yet writ regarding that new world: "One thing remains, men hold their heads an inch higher, there is more pride among men. If you recognize the Revolution as an historical fact, then you must regard it as a whole; you cannot have part of it and not the others. You cannot choose what you will have. The result is still in the laps of the gods."

NATHAN ESSELL.

Correspondence

Religious Liberty—A Closing Word

Editor of UNITY:

I have read with great interest your editorial "Is Religious Liberty Dead in America?" and was indeed surprised at the comments of those who did not understand it at all. Have those people ever heard of Albert C. Diffenbach's book, "Religious Liberty—The Great American Illusion"?

In order to appreciate at its true value Dr. Holmes's editorial, we must dismiss our petty animosities and antagonisms, and come nearer to Dr. Holmes's breadth of mind and liberality of spirit. I would not go as far as to say that religion is the candidate's "own and not the nation's business," but it is to depart far from the truth to state that "it determines one's attitude towards all the affairs of life. It may be called a synthesis of all one's attitudes and principles." No doubt that is the ideal toward

which religion is tending, but the ignorance of the average churchgoer in matters of religion is appalling. How many for instance, know the history of their denomination, its theology, its outlook on modern problems, as determined by the resolutions which are taken from year to year? And how many are willing to put such resolutions into practice? Plainly the thing which matters is the mental equipment of our candidates and their ability to offer constructive policies to solve the problems of the nation, with due consideration to international repercussions. The particular church affiliation of a president does not matter so much, for in any case, once elected, he will be forced to cooperate with other groups. Dr. Holmes, as a humanist, believes that of greater importance than membership in a particular denomination is the underlying sense of humanity which does or should determine our decisions. This is perhaps one of the reasons for Dr. Holmes's great experiment in New York—the Community Church. Hence no one can grasp the whole meaning of his editorial unless he first recognizes this basic assumption.

Therefore, a candidate whether he be a Catholic, a Christian Scientist, or a Communist, has the right to be elected to the presidency so long as he can win through his program the support of the majority of the people. To "vigorously oppose him for election on the ground that a Communist or a Catholic ought not to be elected" is getting very close to bigotry. With respect to the "autocratic control" of the "Catholic machine," this is a debatable point; and after all, who is the president that has not been more or less under the control of big corporations, banking and military interests? Even if it came to autocracy, a remote possibility, moral idealists can provide powerful methods of overcoming it. But to understand this, our so-called "thinking people" would have to do a little more thinking! Of course, if a Communist were elected, he would be biased in favor of radical labor organizations and would bring "Frankenstein Incorporated" to bay. But this would be worth trying, and it might do some good!

In conclusion, I think Dr. Holmes's editorial was timely and necessary. It is not so much a case of Dr. Holmes standing before his critics, it is a case of the critics standing before Dr. Holmes! "We are getting on!"

A. STIERNOTTE.

Calgary, Alberta.

Jefferson's Monticello

Editor of UNITY:

It will be with surprise and even dismay that our people will learn that Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, is in danger of reverting to private ownership. The estate was purchased in 1923 by the Jefferson Memorial Foundation, to be maintained as a public patriotic shrine, like Mount Vernon, and this has been done; but hard times have checked the expected subscriptions, and unless $175,000 of the original purchase price are soon forthcoming, there is imminent danger of foreclosure. The Jefferson Memorial Foundation, 70 Pine street, New York, has issued a public statement, soliciting contributions necessary to meet the situation; and it cannot be doubted that the response will be generous and prompt. The leaders of the two great political parties, both of which make such strong claims to Jefferson, may well engage in friendly rivalry as to which shall be the promptest and most generous. If they do not settle the matter in the next two weeks, then the women of the country, so much better organized than the men, will form Monticello clubs in twenty cities, and settle it in two months. We do not forget that it was the women of the country who saved Mount Vernon in a similar predicament, with the help of the eloquence of Edward Everett. The women of 1932 would surely be similarly helped by the eloquence of Claude Bowers, who in this time has spoken and written more impressively about Jefferson than any other.

It is a noteworthy fact that while one of our great political parties claims Jefferson as its founder and tutelar divinity, the two most memorable tributes to him have come from leaders of the other party. Indeed, the new Republican party at its birth declared, in its famous first platform of 1856, that its purpose was to restore the Government to "the principles of Washington and Jefferson." It was to a Jefferson dinner in Boston in 1859, a time when the Democrats of the country were not holding Jefferson dinners, that Abraham Lincoln, just after his famous debates with Douglas, wrote his memorable letter of tribute to Jefferson, the most memorable of all tributes to Jefferson. It is an impressive conjunction by which the most memorable of all tributes to Washington should be that of Jefferson, as the most notable of tributes to Jefferson himself should be that of Lincoln—thus linking our three great Presidents in a sacramental chain. Jefferson was the pre-eminent anti-slavery man among the founders of the Republic. Lincoln declared him to be, and likely to remain, the greatest of American political thinkers. In his own struggle against slavery, he owed to Jefferson his inspiration, his program and his argument; and he appeals to him more than forty times, as the index to his writings will show to all, while there are but two or three references to Hamilton, and those passing and perfunctory. So eminent a Republican as Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has recently declared in a pregnant and powerful address that, while Hamilton's work was done, Jefferson is but in the morning of his great influence.

I have said that the two most memorable tributes to Jefferson were by Republicans. The first was that by Lincoln. The other was by George F. Hoar. It was published as the general introduction to the complete new edition of Jefferson's works issued some years ago by the Jefferson Memorial Foundation. To my thinking, it is the most noteworthy of all of Senator Hoar's utterances, save only his great Ohio centennial oration at Marietta in 1888. Yet singularly it seems to be but little known, even in Senator Hoar's immediate circle. This is clearly the time when it should be reprinted by leading newspapers. No man can rise from its reading with any doubt as to the custody of Monticello by the American people.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Boston, Massachusetts.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 98)

have a million, while another cannot get a full meal. In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here and sometimes a little rioting. But it matters little, for here the sufferers are not the rulers. The supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be deeply interested in, the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly, the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again; work is plentiful; wages rise and all is tranquility and cheerfulness.

I have seen England three or four times pass through such critical seasons as I have described. Through such seasons the United States will have to pass, in the course of the next century, if not of this. How will you pass through them? I heartily wish you a good deliverance, but my reason and my wishes are at war and I cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. For with you the majority is the government and has the rich, who are always a minority, absolutely at its mercy. The day will come when, in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose the legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, a strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about tyranny of capitalists and usurers and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest people are in want of necessities. Which of these two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for bread?

I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning: that you will act like people in a year of scarcity; devour all the seedcorn and thus make the next year not of scarcity, but of absolute distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stay you. Your constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when society has entered on this downward progress,

either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference,—that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have engendered within your country by your own institutions.

Thinking this, of course I cannot reckon Jefferson among the benefactors of mankind.

The Doukhobors — Christian Martyrs of Today

By Walter Siegmeister, Ph.D.

At all times in history there have existed a group of idealists working for humanity's onward progress and willing to sacrifice everything—even life itself—for this end. In ancient Greece we had Pythagoras and his followers who were burnt alive for their revolutionary activities in attempting to establish a more moral individual and social life (based on vegetarianism, the freedom of women, communism, etc.). Five centuries later we had the group of revolutionary social reformers known as the early Christians who continued the work that Pythagoras started, and whose doctrines (vegetarianism, chastity, communism, etc.) were essentially Pythagorean. They also suffered death at the hands of Mammonistic Rome because of their determination, courage, and persistence in the practice of their ideals. The communities of the early Christians constituted a new co-operative commonwealth which was in opposition to Roman capitalism and was finally destroyed by it in a most brutal and inhuman manner.

Among the early Christians there existed a sect known as the Manichaeans, founded by the great religious reformer, Mani. The Manichaeans, of all other Christian sects, adhered most strictly to the Pythagorean life of vegetarianism, chastity, and communism; they composed a society of their own, consisting of numerous communities. It is from the Manichaeans that the historical descent of the Doukhobors may be traced. This sect assumed form in the Ukraine in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and to it flocked the most revolutionary spirits in Russia, who were willing to give their lives in humanity's service and in battling against the evils of Church and State. The Doukhobors composed the vanguard of Russian revolutionists, working for the freedom of their people. Like the early Christian martyrs, thousands met death in the service of their cause.

Tolstoy greatly sympathized with these people, whose ideals were so similar to his own. It is believed by several writers on the Doukhobors that their present doctrines (vegetarianism, opposition to governments, to warfare, to the payment of taxes, to public schools, etc.) may be directly traced to Tolstoy, with whose doctrines their leader, Verigin, became acquainted during his imprisonment in Siberia. Tolstoy wrote his great novel, Resurrection (the only one for which he accepted a royalty), in order to aid the Doukhobors to migrate from the Caucasus to Western Canada, where they settled about thirty years ago. During this period they succeeded in building up a Modern Utopia, a communistic society which composes a small nation by itself, containing a population of over 10,000.

At present, 700 Doukhobors, men and women, are in prison at New Westminster, British Columbia, on a three year term, because of their determination to live up to their high ideals. Over a hundred small children have been taken away from their devoted parents and placed in reformatories where they are treated most unsympathetically and cruelly. Seventeen nursing babies have been taken away from their mothers, and several died in consequence. The agony thus inflicted upon these fine women and devoted mothers (who wail continually for their infants) is unspeakable. These people have been imprisoned and so inhumanely treated simply because of their determination to obey the dictates of their conscience and to do what they consider best for their children. Being opposed to militarism, they refuse to pay taxes or send their children to government schools, for they believe that by doing this they will further and support the spirit of militarism, which is the great evil of which they want to free humanity. The charge on the basis of which they have been convicted was Nudism.

One Doukhobor, Pete Maloff, writes as follows from the Oakalla Prison at New Westminster, B. C.: *"This is the most shameful crime that civilized people have ever committed.* . . I cannot say much now. Some of us already have been moved to the island where rough penitentiary rules are forced on us. We are standing strongly and will not bend even if it will cost our lives.

"Our burden is heavy and there should be relief. But our faith is deep and we have some of it in reserve yet. We hope to continue the struggle and carry the burden further on our shoulders."

Something should be done to help these people who are so greatly misunderstood and so cruelly treated by their Canadian neighbors and especially by government and police authorities. Letters of protest and petitions demanding their release should be sent to the Canadian government.

On July 3, 1932, Pete Maloff wrote me from prison: "After eight days of hunger strike we begin to eat. Some are so weak, very slight chance to recover. Doctor refused to give castor oil, enema, or anything. Terrible, terrible, and terrible. Yes, we are living in the twentieth century.

"Motherhood is in rebellion. Something must be done to relieve the nervous tension. Children are wailing for mothers. But the civilized—poor with common-sense—continue to torment the soul of motherhood.

"Well we are trying our best to withstand the wind. Maybe some of us will fall. Truth has always been bought and rebought only on Golgotha. Women are in a terrible state. Don't think that I will be able to write to you soon."

At that time the Doukhobors at the Oakalla Prison sent the following appeal:

"We are sincere and earnest followers of Christ. We are continuing his great struggle for the liberation of man from hypocrisy and idolatry. And we will never give up the Ideal of Christ. We are not slaves of any man-made authorities.

"This last eight days we have been on a hunger strike in pray of our innocence. And especially for the innocent children. We have a deep love for children and we cannot hold our inherited love for them in silence.

"We are definitely aware that our children are used in the roughest way and are strapped, hit with the legs of chairs, and segregated into black holes. Now we declare before you seriously that if you will not stop this barbarous treatment and will not deliver them to us, remember that our struggle will finish either with life or death.

"We have a deep ideology and we are not playing any games. We have warned in Nelson with a four-day fast and here we give you serious warning with an eight day one.

"Take this matter into consideration and give it deepest investigation."

DOUKHOBORS OF OAKALLA.

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Including the Momentous Events of the Last Two Years

By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND M.A., D.D.

Former President of the India Information Bureau of America and Editor of "Young India" (New York). Twice Special Commissioner and Lecturer to India. Author of "India, America and World Brotherhood," "Causes of Famine in India," etc.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date With New Chapters on

The London Round Table Conferences
Gandhi in England
India's New Constitution
Boycott of British Goods
Lord Willingdon's Shocking Ordinances
India's Future
Etc.

589 pages, fully indexed, now only $2 per copy

LEWIS COPELAND CO., INC.
Publishers
570 Lexington Avenue. NewYork, N.Y.